



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/699,148

10/31/2003

Daniel Paul Karipides

T00105

1477

33438 7590 04/04/2011
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP
P.O. BOX 203518
AUSTIN, TX 78720

EXAMINER

JEANTY, ROMAIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3624

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/04/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tmunoz@hamiltontertile.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/699,148	KARIPIDES, DANIEL PAUL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Romain Jeanty	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed December 22, 2010. Claims 1-44 remain pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With regard to the 101 rejection, applicant has amended the claims to recite 1, 14, and 26 have been amended to recite "performing using the data processing system, wherein the data processing system includes a computer system", and applicant further argued that the claims are tied to a particular machine. In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. None of the claimed steps such as developing, processing, collecting, matching and determining are performing in a computer processor. Therefore, the 101 rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-13 and 29-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "performing using the data processing system...". It unclear as what is being performed in that limitation. Applicant is suggested to amend the claim to recite what is being performed. In addition, the performing step has no relationship with the rest of the claimed limitations.

Claims 1, 29 and 44 recite the limitation "determining product demand from the evaluations", it is unclear how the determining step is done. Applicant is suggested to amend the claim to recite how the determining step is done.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "determining product demand", it is unclear how the determining step is performed. Applicant is suggested to amend the claim to recite how the determining step is performed.

Claims 2-13, 27-28 and 30-43 depend from claims 1, 26 and 29; therefore claims 2-13, 27-28 and 30-43 are rejected under 35 USC 112 second rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1, 14 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on recent Supreme Court precedent and Federal Circuit decisions. The Office's guidance to examiners is that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) particularly transform a particular article to a different state or thing (also referred to as the "machine-or-transformation test"). *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876); *In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed Cir. 2008). Also see USPTO Memoranda, "Guidance for Examining Process Claims in view of *In re Bilski*," January 7, 2009 and "New Interim Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Examination Instructions," August 24, 2009. Both memoranda may be located on the USPTO website at: <http://www.uspto.gov/web/patents/memoranda.htm>.

Additionally, there are two corollaries to the machine-or-transformation test. First, a mere field-of-use limitation is generally insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible method claim patentable. This means the machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the method claim's scope to pass the test. Second, insignificant extra-solution activity will not transform an unpatentable principle into a patentable process. This means reciting a specific machine or particular transformation of a specific article in an insignificant step, such as data gathering or outputting, is not sufficient to pass the test.

If neither prong of the machine-or-transformation test is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. 101 and is non-statutory subject matter.

It is further noted that mere recitation of a machine in the preamble in a manner such that the machine fails to patentably limit the scope of the claim does not make the claim statutory under 35 USC 101, as seen in the Board of Patent Appeals Informative Opinion *Ex Parte Langemyr et al. (Appeal 2008-1495)*.

In the instant case, Applicant's method steps fail the first prong since they are not tied to a particular machine and can be performed without the use of a particular machine or apparatus. For example, the broadest reasonable interpretation of claim 1 would be a method that could be performed by hand. Similarly, Applicant's method steps fail the second prong because they do not result in a transformation of a particular article to a different state or thing. Thus, claims 1, 14 and 26 are non-statutory.

Dependent claims 2-13, 15-25 and 27-28 merely add further details of the method steps recited in claims 1, 14 and 26 without including any tie to a particular machine or apparatus or any transformation of a particular article to a different state or thing in a step that is more than insignificant extra-solution activity or mere field-of-use. Therefore, dependent claims 2-13, 15-25 and 27-28 are also non-statutory as they also fail both prongs of the machine-or-transformation test.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (571) 272-6732. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynda Jasmin can be reached on (571) 272-6782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Romain Jeanty/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3624
March 26, 2011